

Appl. No. 10/658,571
Amdt. Dated December 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request further consideration of the claims under 37 CFR 1.116. Applicants have now amended the claims submit that neither reference raised by the Examiner teaches or suggests the subject matter of the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Examiner's rejection of claims 1 - 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Examiner has rejected these claims in view of the cited prior art references of *Taniguchi et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,239,228) and *Yakio* (Jap. Pat. Pub. No. 05-182759). The *Taniguchi* reference is directed to "a thin-film EL device adapted to display multiple colors and having a sealing plate which can be fixed to a substrate without affecting picture element with adhesive squeezed out." (Column 1, line 65 - Column 2, line 2). *Taniguchi*, however, actually teaches away from Applicants' currently claimed invention, and therefore cannot be used to form an obviousness rejection in combination with the *Yakio* reference. Furthermore, *Taniguchi* teaches away from the formation of resin over the light-emitting area in order to improve light transmittance, and therefore cannot be combined with a reference which teaches the formation of resin over the light-emitting area in order to form an obviousness rejection. See *In re Grasselli*, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination.")

Taniguchi teaches the formation of a void 50 over the light-emitting region and the non-formation of adhesive sealant over the same region in order to improve transmittance of

page 5 of 7

Appl. No. 10/658,571
Amdt. Dated December 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

the device. The adhesive 52 is thus formed outside of the light-emitting region, and the relief pattern 53 is formed to prevent the adhesive from being squeezed inwards and over the light-emitting region, thereby preventing a decrease in light transmittance. (See Column 7, lines 28 – 34). Therefore, the *Taniguchi* reference fails to teach or suggest the formation of relief portion in order to prevent resin from flowing out to the electrode region, as currently claimed. Applicant's invention is directed to preventing the leakage of resin to the outer electrode region and the resultant defects in the connection between the external electrodes 4 and the external terminals 5 (See page 4 of Applicant's written disclosure). In order to highlight these distinctions, Applicants have modified the independent claims to further specify that the relief portion captures an outward flow of resin from the light emitting region such that electrodes adjacent the light emitting region are substantially free of resin.

Applicants respectfully submit that none of the prior art references of record, provide any teaching or suggestion whatsoever regarding this advance in the art. As noted above, apparently none of the references have recognized the undesirable result of having resin extend over adjacent electrodes which is prevented by Applicants' instant innovation. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the prior art rejections set forth by the Examiner are improper and should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/658,571
Amdt. Dated December 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 2, 2005

Examiner's remaining references cited but not relied upon, considered either alone or in combination, also fail to teach applicant's currently claimed invention. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Date: 12/28/05

Respectfully submitted,

(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.
105 W. Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Tel: (312) 704-1890
Attorney for Applicants

page 7 of 7